

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 22-5896-GW-ASx	Date	September 19, 2025
Title	<i>Sara Ochoa v. Zeroo Gravity Games LLC</i>		

---

---

Present: The Honorable	GEORGE H. WU, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
------------------------	--

---

Javier Gonzalez

None Present

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None Present

None Present

**PROCEEDINGS: IN CHAMBERS - ORDER FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FILING  
REGARDING ATTORNEY FEES**

The Court previously indicated that it was unable to determine whether the amount of time expended in this litigation by Plaintiffs' counsel was reasonable based upon the manner in which the time entries were presented to the Court. *See* Tentative, Docket No. 164 at 18-19. Plaintiffs' counsel subsequently filed a declaration and attached a further breakdown of the time spent on various tasks and dates on which they were completed. *See* Declaration of Andrew Ryan ("Ryan Decl."), Ex. A, Docket No. 165. At the September 18 hearing, the Court indicated that it would require further information from Plaintiffs' counsel.

A court "may exclude from [a] fee request any 'excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary' hours." *Blumenthal Distrib., Inc. v. Comoch Inc.*, 652 F. Supp. 3d 1117, 1133 (C.D. Cal. 2023) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)). By the Court's count, there are approximately 150 discrete time entries for "review[ing] ads in games." *See* Ryan Decl., Ex. A. The Court appreciates Plaintiffs' need to observe patterns within and consistency among advertisement offerings within Defendant's games over a period of time in order to substantiate the claims alleged. Ryan Decl. ¶ 7. However, the Court notes that this factual, investigatory work is non-legal and does not require the skills and experience of an attorney, particularly after establishing a baseline understanding of the frequency and kinds of sales presentations in the games. Without any further detail or context in the entries themselves, the sheer amount of time entries dedicated to this task, as well as the respective and variable amounts of time within each entry, strikes the Court as excessive. Accordingly, the Court requires further detail and justification for the amount of time devoted to this review and an explanation as to why the efforts of Mr. Ryan, the senior attorney on this case, were required. The Court would also like Plaintiffs' counsel to provide a total estimate of the amount of time spent just on this task.

After Defendant and the Court raised the issue of whether any legal research in this case was duplicative with another ongoing case also presently being litigated by Plaintiffs' counsel, Plaintiffs' counsel indicated that there was some overlap but time was "allocated" among the respective matters

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 22-5896-GW-ASx	Date	September 19, 2025
Title	<i>Sara Ochoa v. Zeroo Gravity Games LLC</i>		

without double-counting. Ryan Decl. ¶ 8. However, Plaintiffs’ counsel did not indicate how such time was allocated. The Court would like Plaintiffs’ counsel to indicate how they allocated time between the two cases.

The Court would also apply a percentage reduction on block-billed time, unless Plaintiffs’ counsel further breaks down the block-billed entries into discrete tasks. The Court notes that some block-billed entries are those involving reviewing the game advertisements, and some appear to include arguably clerical work, such as filing-related tasks. For any block-billed entries Plaintiffs’ counsel do not further break down, Plaintiffs’ counsel shall provide a total estimate of block-billed time.

Finally, while undoubtedly reasonable for Plaintiffs’ counsel to dedicate significant attention and time to responding to potentially dispositive motions, the Court would like Plaintiffs’ counsel to address why certain tasks took so long to complete. For instance, Plaintiffs’ counsel spent nearly 100 hours “draft[ing]/revis[ing]” their opposition to Defendant’s Rule 11 motion; over 70 hours drafting and revising their opposition to Defendant’s motion to dismiss, not counting legal research; over 40 hours drafting and revising a motion to compel discovery and corresponding declaration; and nearly 70 hours drafting and revising the motion for preliminary settlement approval (some of which was spent “prepar[ing] for the hearing”). See Ryan Decl., Ex. A.

Plaintiffs shall have until September 24, 2025 to provide the Court with the information requested above, after which the Court will issue a further tentative ruling on attorney fees. Upon receipt of the tentative, Plaintiffs’ counsel shall indicate to the Court whether they would like a hearing on the tentative. If a hearing is requested, the Court shall set a hearing at that point in time.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**